

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/091,711

Applicant(s)

MORI ET AL.

Examiner

Lee Lum

Art Unit

3611

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) L Lum- examiner.

(3) J Lerch - atty.

(2) L Morris - SPE.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 11 February 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Coles.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see Addendum.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Addendum to Interview Summary

Mr. Lerch argued that Coles did not disclose "a rotor with magnets in a plurality of recesses in a rotor core", as recited in Claims 1 and 9. Ms. Morris maintained that the reference, in fact, disclosed this arrangement, as depicted in fig 12, with magnets 27 fitted into recesses (unidentified) in the rotor core 26. Mr. Lerch agreed with this interpretation, and would confer with his client.

Ms. Lee S. Lum
Examiner
2/11/04